

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/652,815	08/29/2003	Douglas A. Bulleit	. 9400-65	2478
39072 7590 07/11/2007 MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC, P.A. P.O. BOX 37428			EXAMINER	
			CHAMPAGNE, LUNA	
RALEIGH, NC 27627			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3627	
		•		
		•	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		•				
		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/652,815 .	BULLEIT ET AL.			
•	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Luna Champagne	3627			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period verse to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDON	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status		•				
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 July 2004</u> .					
2a) <u></u> □	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-40</u> is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) <u>1-40</u> is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on 29 August 2003 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	a) accepted or b) objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So tion is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119	·				
12) <u>□</u> a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document  2. Certified copies of the priority document  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau  See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applica rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ved in this National Stage			
Attachmer		Ω□	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
2) Notice 3) Infor	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date 7/6/04.	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail [ 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/652,815

Art Unit: 3627

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 9 recites the limitation "the request is first request" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 4. Claims 1-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Roden (5,970,477).

Re claims 1, 13, 17 and 29 Roden teaches a method/system of operating a broadband communication network, comprising: establishing a communication flow between a network access terminal and a site using the broadband communication network (providing an originating station with access to a distributed computing network -see e.g. col. 4, lines 61-64); and allocating a cost of the communication flow between the network access terminal and the site between a first account associated with a user of the network access terminal and a second account associated with an entity other than the user of the network access terminal ( A billing system allocates a cost

associated with the communication between a first account associated with the monitored network site and a second account associated with the originating station - see e.g. col. 6, lines 19-25).

Re claims 2, 14, 18, and 30, Roden teaches a method/system wherein allocating the cost of the communication flow comprises: allocating the cost of the communication flow between the network access terminal and the site between the first account associated with the user of the network access terminal and the second account associated with the entity other than the user of the network access terminal based on a performance level of the communication flow (see e.g. col. 5, lines 10-13).

Re claims 4, 20, and 32, Roden teaches a method/system further comprising: receiving a request from the network access terminal and/or the site to provide the communication flow at the enhanced performance level; and providing the communication flow at the enhanced performance level (see e.g. col. 4, lines 64-67; col. 5, lines 1-5).

Re claims 5, 21, and 33, Roden teaches a method/system wherein the cost of the communication flow comprises a base cost for providing the communication flow at a base performance level and an incremental cost, in addition to the base cost, for providing the communication flow at an enhanced performance level, and wherein allocating the cost of the communication flow comprises: (\$5 per month, plus 5 cents)

per minute - see e.g. col. 5, lines 11-13) allocating the base cost of the communication flow between the network access terminal and the site to the first account associated with the user of the network access terminal; and allocating the incremental cost of the communication flow between the network access terminal and the site to the second account associated with an entity other than the user of the network access terminal (see e.g. col. 9, lines 50-52).

Re claims 6, 22, and 34, Roden teaches a method/system wherein the cost of the communication flow comprises a base cost for providing the communication flow at a base performance level and an incremental cost, in addition to the base cost, for providing the communication flow at an enhanced performance level, and wherein allocating the cost of the communication flow comprises: allocating the base cost and the incremental cost of the communication flow between the network access terminal and the site to the first account associated with the user of the network access terminal.

Re claims 7, 23, and 35, Roden teaches a method/system wherein the cost of the communication flow comprises a base cost for providing the communication flow at a base performance level and an incremental cost, in addition to the base cost, for providing the communication flow at an enhanced performance level, and wherein allocating the cost of the communication flow comprises: (see e.g. col. 5, lines 11-13) allocating the base cost and the incremental cost of the communication flow between

the network access terminal and the site to the second account associated with an entity other than the user of the network access terminal see e.g. col. 8, lines 48-49).

Re claims 8, 24, and 36 Roden teaches a method/system further comprising: using an authentication mechanism to verify that the network access terminal and/or the site is authorized to modify the performance level of the broadband communication network and/or allocation of the cost of the communication flow (see e.g. col. 10, lines 61-67; col. 11, lines 1-9).

Re claims 9, 25, and 37, Roden teaches a method/system wherein the request is a first request, the method further comprising: receiving a second request from the network access terminal and/or the site to provide the communication flow at the base performance level; and wherein allocating the cost of the communication flow comprises: allocating the cost of the communication flow between the network access terminal and the site between the first account associated with the user of the network access terminal and the second account associated with at the entity other than the user of the network access terminal based on the performance level of the communication flow if the network access terminal and/or the site is authorized to modify the performance level of the broadband communication network and/or allocation of the cost of the communication flow (see e.g. col. 5, lines 42-60).

Re claims 10, 16, 26, and 38, Roden teaches a method/system wherein the performance level is based on at least one of bandwidth of the communication flow, duration of the communication flow, latency associated with the communication flow, jitter associated with the communication flow, dropped packets associated with the communication flow, quality of service (QoS) associated with the communication flow, traffic shaping associated with the communication flow, and priority of the communication flow (*The allocation is based on the duration of the communication - see e.g. col. 5, lines 10-13*).

Re claims 11, 27, and 39, Roden teaches a method/system, wherein the entity is associated with the site (see e.g. col. 4, lines 21-23).

Re claims 12, 28, and 40, Roden teaches a method/system wherein the entity is associated with a third party that is not associated with the site (see e.g. col.9, lines 57-61).

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3, 15, 19, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roden (5,970,477), in view of Kung et al. (6,775,267 B1).

Re claims 3, 15,19, and 31, Roden teaches a method wherein allocating the cost of the communication flow comprises: allocating the cost of the communication flow between the first account and the second account

Roden does not specifically teach allocating the cost based on whether the communication flow is at a base performance level or an enhanced performance level that exceeds the base performance level

However, Kung et al. teach allocating the cost based on whether the communication flow is at a base performance level (*default quality of service*) or an enhanced performance level that exceeds the base performance level (*required bit rate*) (see e.g. col. 2, lines 50-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Roden, and include the steps of allocating the cost based on base performance level or an enhanced performance level that exceeds the base performance level, as taught by Kung et al., in order to control costs for the communication network.

#### Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Fan (US 2003/0079021 A1).

Application/Control Number: 10/652,815

Art Unit: 3627

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

Page 8

examiner should be directed to Luna Champagne whose telephone number is (571)

272-7177. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Florian Zeender can be reached on (571) 272-6790. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Luna Champagne

6/27/07

Examiner-

Art Unit 3627

6/25/07

F. RYAN ZEENDER

PRIMARY EXAMINER